

ber "46" shows that this is indeed the species described as *P. leptophyllum*.

Pichi-Sermolli has chosen as lectotype *Tournefort 5337* in the Paris herbarium. Barrelier's herbarium was destroyed by fire, and so no specimen by him can be lectotype. This leaves Magnol (1697), who indicated that he had been given his specimen by Tournefort. No Magnol herbarium is known, and therefore Pichi-Sermolli goes back to the Tournefort Herbarium, where the plant now known as *Anogramma leptophylla* is represented by sheet 5337, which is therefore designated as lectotype. But there is really no proof that this specimen has anything to do with the species—it was not cited by Linnaeus, it was not seen by Linnaeus, and in fact Linnaeus did not mention Tournefort at all; and there is no certainty at all that the plant that Tournefort gave to Magnol was really the same as this sheet in the Tournefort Herbarium. Therefore, *Tournefort 5337* as a lectotype is impossible, especially when there is a perfectly good specimen in the Linnean Herbarium to be the obvious lectotype. Therefore, I propose the sheet 1251.56 in the Linnean Herbarium as lectotype of *Polypodium leptophyllum* L. and reject *Tournefort 5337*.

NATIONAL MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY, WASHINGTON, D.C.
20560.

Taxonomic Notes on Ferns, IV

C. V. MORTON

In the previous numbers of this series of casual notes on ferns, I published on *Athyrium lilloi* (Amer. Fern J. **50**: 275, 276. 1960), on *Thelypteris* sect. *Glaphyropteris*, *Blechnum penna-marina*, and *Asplenium varians* (Amer. Fern J. **51**: 37–39. 1961), and on *Anopteris hexagona* and *Elaphoglossum denudatum* (Amer. Fern J. **52**: 148–150. 1962). The present paper discusses four species of Chile, Argentina, and subantarctic South America.

LOMARIA MICROPHYLLA Goldm. Nov. Act. Acad. Caes. Leop. Carol. **16**, Suppl. 1: 460. 1843 = *Blechnum microphyllum* (Goldm.) Morton, *comb. nov.*

Lomaria australis Kunze, *Linnaea* 9: 57. 1834. Type: "Crescit in Chil. austr. Andibus ad Antuco, Lect. 1828," *Poeppig*. The holotype in the Kunze Herbarium was destroyed in Leipzig during the war. An undoubted isotype in the herbarium in Berlin-Dahlem, marked in Kunze's hand as "*Lomaria australis mihi*," is here designated lectotype (Morton photograph 10182). This photograph shows that *L. australis* is not a synonym of *Blechnum penna-marina* (Poir.) Kuhn, as indicated in the "Index Filicum," but is the same as the species later described as *Lomaria germainii* Hook. The epithet "*australis*," although the oldest for this species, may not be used in *Blechnum* because of the existence of *B. australe* L. (1767).

Lomaria gayana Rémy & Fée in Gay, *Hist. Fis. Pol. Chile Bot.* 6: 481. 1853. Type: "Cordilleras de Talcaregue, provincia de Colchagua," Chile, *Gay*.

Blechnum poeppigianum Sturm, *Enum. Pl. Crypt. Vasc. Chil.* 26. 1859. Based on *Lomaria australis* Kunze, non *Blechnum australe* L.

Blechnum gayanum (Rémy & Fée) Sturm, *Enum. Pl. Crypt. Vasc. Chil.* 24. 1859.

Lomaria germainii Hook. *Sp. Fil.* 3: 32, pl. 152. 1860. Syntypes: Cerro de la Campaña de Quillota, *Germain* and Antuco, Chile, *Poeppig*. Looser chose the Germain collection as lectotype.

Blechnum germainii (Hook.) Christ, *Bull. Herb. Boiss.* II, 2: 554. 1902.

Type: Chile, *Meyen*.

I have seen a specimen in the herbarium in Berlin-Dahlem collected in Chile by Meyen and marked "*Blechnum (Lomaria) microphyllum* n. sp." (Morton photograph 10180). This is surely an isotype and possibly the holotype. I do not know the location of Goldmann's holotypes. This species is not, as indicated in Christensen's "Index Filicum," a synonym of *Blechnum penna-marina* (Poir.) Kuhn, but is identical with *Blechnum gayanum* (Rémy & Fée) Sturm, as suspected by Gualterio Looser in his revision of the genus *Blechnum* in Chile¹. However, since he had not seen the type, Looser placed *Lomaria microphylla* Goldm. among the dubious species. In the "Index Filicum," *Lomaria gayana* is also referred erroneously to *B. penna-marina*, but, as shown by Looser, it also belongs with the species that has been generally known as

¹ *Revista Universitaria (Universidad Catol. de Chile)* 32(2): 7-105, fig. 1-16. 1947.

Lomaria germainii Hook. or *Blechnum germainii* (Hook.) Christ. Additional synonyms, according to Looser, are *Blechnum andicola* (Phil.) C. Chr. and *B. araucana* (Phil.) C. Chr. A Chilean specimen collected by Werdermann has been distributed under the unpublished name "*Blechnum nivale* Reimers, n. sp."

LOMARIA SETIGERA Gaud. Ann. Sci. Nat. [Paris] 5: 98. 1823 = *Blechnum magellanicum* Desv. var. **angustiseta** (Bory) Morton, *comb. nov.*

Lomaria magellanica β *angustiseta* Bory ex Dumont d'Urville, Ann. Linn. Soc. [Paris] 4: 597. 1825 [1826]. Based on *Lomaria setigera* Gaud.

Blechnum magellanicum (Desv.) Mett. var. *setigerum* (Gaud.) C. Chr. Ark. för Bot. 10(2): 9. 1910. Based on *Lomaria setigera* Gaud. Incorrect, since the earliest varietal name was not adopted.

Blechnum tabulare (Thunb.) Kuhn var. *setigerum* (Gaud.) Capurro, Anais Prim. Reun. Sul-Amer. Bot. 2: 124. 1940. Incorrect, since the earliest varietal name was not adopted.

Type: Iles Malouines, i.e. Falkland Islands, Antarctic South America, *Gaudichaud* (holotype P, Morton photograph 4406).

PTYCHOPYLLUM MAGELLANICUM Klotzsch, Linnaea 18: 533. 1844 [May-Aug., 1845] = *Hymenophyllum seselifolium* K. B. Presl.

Hymenophyllum magellanicum (Klotzsch) Kunze, Bot. Zeit. 5: 226. 1847. (wrongly attributed to "Willdenow").

It is unfortunate that the species well known in southern South America as *Hymenophyllum magellanicum* (Klotzsch) Willd. must now be called *H. seselifolium* K. B. Presl, a name perhaps never used since its original publication. Presl published this species in his little book "Hymenophyllaceae" which is dated "1843" but which probably came out in 1844 (see William T. Stearn, J. Soc. Bibl. Nat. Hist. 3: 15. 1954). Klotzsch's name *Ptychophyllum magellanicum* is in a volume of Linnaea dated "1844," but Stafleu's recent and invaluable "Taxonomic Literature" establishes the actual date of publication as between May and August, 1845. Thus Presl's name has clear priority of a year or more. Klotzsch based his new species on a plant from the Straits of Magellan in the Willdenow Herbarium (no. 20245) in Berlin and on a specimen from Chiloé Island collected by Philippi. Presl's type came from Chiloé also, a collection of Hugh Cuming

(no. 6, presumably in the Presl Herbarium in Prague).

Another name for this species is *Didymoglossum magellanicum* Desv. (Mém. Soc. Linn. Paris 6: 331. 1827), which was based on a collection merely indicated as from South America. The holotype is in the Desvaux Herbarium in Paris (Morton photograph 4596); it was very likely collected by Commerson. Desvaux and Klotzsch independently adopted the epithet "*magellanicum*," a naturally appropriate name considering the locality involved. Although Desvaux' name is the earliest for this species, it may not now be transferred to *Hymenophyllum* because there is already the name *Hymenophyllum magellanicum* (Klotzsch) Kunze, which although taxonomically the same is not nomenclaturally the same since it is based on a different type.

MERTENSIA MAGELLANICA Desv. Mém. Soc. Linn. Paris 6: 201. 1827.

Desvaux attributed this name to Poiret, referring to Poiret in Lamarck. Encycl. Méth. Suppl. 3: 669. 1813; however, at this place there is no species called *Mertensia magellanica*. The epithet *magellanica* must be derived from the Straits of Magellan, and the only species on the page cited by Desvaux that is from this locality is *Mertensia quadripartita* Poir. This is however only an inference, although a logical one, and so the name *M. magellanica* Desv. must be considered a *nomen nudum*, since there is no description and no complete reference to a description under another name. That the inference mentioned above is correct is shown by a specimen in the herbarium of the Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris, where a specimen from the Desvaux Herbarium is labelled "*Mertensia magellanica* Poiret" in the hand of Desvaux (Morton photograph 4530); this specimen is from the Straits of Magellan, Commerson, and is in fact an isotype of *Polypodium quadripartitum* Poir. (in Lam. Encycl. Méth. 5: 543. 1804), which was later called *Mertensia quadripartita* (Poir.) Poir. The name "*M. magellanica*" was very likely merely a slip of memory on the part of Desvaux, but it has gotten into the literature.

NATIONAL MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20560.